DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 268 174 TM 860 237

AUTHOR Koppel, Sheree P.; Isenhour, Karen D.
TITLE Map Out a Public Preschool Care and Education Plan: Multiphased Need Assessment for Program Decisions. [Draft].
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 73p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (70th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Study; Data Collection; Educational Planning; Evaluation Methods; *Interviews; *Needs Assessment; *Preschool Children; Preschool Education; Program Content; Program Descriptions; *Program Design; Public Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Multiphased Need Assessment for Program Decisions

ABSTRACT

The Multiphased Need Assessment for Program Decisions (MAP) was designed to inform decision makers of a large urban school district concerning the need for early childhood programs in the community. The goals were to indicate the types of programs desired by the community; to bring together public school preschool experts; and to coordinate community perceptions, preschool professional expertise, and parental desires in a study preliminary to preschool program planning. This paper outlines the MAP process and discusses MAP implementation and findings. The study utilized three separate need assessment techniques: (1) community forums; (2) key informant process; and (3) nominal group technique. MAP resulted in full descriptions of program ideas agreed upon by community members, preschool professionals, and parents of preschool children. Following the study, a pilot preschool project was begun in three schools. These programs were successful enough to merit expanded services the second year after completion of the need study. The diversity of input and the potential for building consensus and developing commitment to resulting programs are unique results of the MAP process. The appendices contain data collected through each of the assement techniques used in the study. (PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED268174

MAP OUT A PUBLIC PRESCHOOL CARE AND EDUCATION PLAN: MULTIPHASED NEED ASSESSMENT FOR PROGRAM DECISIONS

by:
Sheree P. Koppel
University of Louisville/Mercy Academy

Karen D. Isenhour
University of Louisville/Seven Counties Services, Inc.

Paper presented as part of the SIG/Early Education and Child Development's Session "Policy and Evaluation in Early Childhood Education".

American Educational Research Association
Annual Meeting, San Francisco
April 16-April 20, 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S.P. Koppel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
[X] This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
[ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Draft for discussion purposes only. Not to be reproduced or used without permission which may be obtained from the senior author at the address below.

Mercy Academy
1176 E. Broadway
Louisville, Kentucky
40204

TM 860 237

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MAP OUT A PUBLIC PRESCHOOL CARE AND EDUCATION PLAN:
MULTIPHASED NEED ASSESSMENT FOR PROGRAM DECISIONS

Abstract

In recent years, public school systems across the country have developed preschool care and education packages for their publics. The study here describes the implementation of a multiphased, qualitative need assessment model in a large, metropolitan school system. Researchers can use the assessment design to determine community needs for preschool programs in the public sector.

Multiphased Assessment for Program Decisions (MAP) is an organizational development tool that combines the techniques of community forums, key informant consultation, and Nominal Groups in a single study. Community forums, open to anyone living in the area served by the school system, provided constituents (parents, child care professionals, community representatives) with the opportunity to express their needs for child care and preschool programs or to voice opinions of the public school system's entrance into this traditionally private service area. Key informants, professionals with knowledge in the areas of child care and early education, review the needs collected during forums and design possible programs to meet those needs. Professionals also view all programs and rank order them according to the strength with which programs respond to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

identified needs. Finally, groups of parents with children in the targeted age range (three-five years old) review programs and select those they feel would best meet their needs.

A description of each phase of the need study in an urban school system includes all materials used. In addition, much of the data from the study is presented in order that prospective researchers might have the opportunity to review the kinds of information that MAP provides.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

The decision makers of a large (approximately 95,000 students) urban school district planned to initiate a preschool program as part of the array of public school services and opportunities. Though these individuals had a number of competent early childhood experts at their disposal, they were uninformed concerning the need for early childhood programs in the community. Implementation of Multiphased Need Assessment for Program Decisions (MAP) had a number of goals, then.

First, MAP would indicate the types of programs members of the community with preschool children desired. Second, MAP would bring together preschool experts from the public school system, from a nearby state university, and from various human service and private sector institutions. Through the processes of MAP, individuals from these various organizations would meet and work together designing suitable programs. Private sector fear of public infringement on the domain of early childhood programs would be reduced because of the involvement of these individuals in the study. Third, MAP would coordinate the perceptions of community members, the expertise of preschool professionals, and the desires of parents in a study preliminary to preschool program planning. This paper outlines the MAP process and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

discusses MAP implementation and findings in a public school system's community.

The MAP study utilized three separate need assessment techniques. All three methods receive ample treatment in need assessment literature and are considered viable processes for gathering data on needs. In addition, MAP resulted in full descriptions of program ideas agreed upon by community members, preschool professionals, and parents of preschool children in the geographic area served by the school system. Following the study, the school system began a pilot preschool program in three schools throughout the area served. These programs were successful enough to result in expanded services the second year after completion of the need study. MAP guided the decision making that resulted in a successful program. A school system considering the implementation of an early childhood care and education program should also consider employment of MAP as a method of need assessment prior to making program decisions.

Method

MAP began in the Midwest County Public Schools (MCPS) with an examination of the area's most recent census data. Though census information is not a routine element of the MAP process, researchers believed that information on the number of preschool children, the number of children

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

enrolled in public and private preschool and day care programs, the number of children in homes with female heads of households, and the number of children in homes with incomes below the poverty level would provide a context for other data collected during the MAP study.

Theoretical support for the MAP approach to need assessment described here has been presented in Koppel and Dunbar (1984) and Koppel (1986). In addition, two other need assessments using the MAP approach, Dunbar, Barnes, Carrithers, Koppel and Murrell (1983) and Koppel (1985), have been undertaken successfully. The description of method below is abridged, and those wishing further theoretical background should consult these works.

Phase One. Researchers met several times with a committee of individuals commissioned by the superintendent of MCPS for the purpose of implementing a public preschool program. As a result of these meetings, researchers began an assessment of needs for care and education of children aged three to five. This assessment would provide committee members and the school system's decision makers with: (a) a list of currently perceived needs based on parent and community member input; (b) program ideas generated by knowledgeable professionals in response to these statements of need; and (c) information concerning community response to program ideas.

The MAP process continued with community forums

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

held in six locations throughout the school system's geographic area. The forum meetings served as arenas for the generation of a list of needs obtained from participating parents of young children as well as from caregivers serving three to five year olds.

The community forum is generally an unstructured meeting to which general invitations are issued and in which all constituents are encouraged to participate. Researchers ask demographic and substantive questions of participants who record their responses, usually in written form. Forums of this type are, according to Murrell (Personal communication, October 6, 1982) direct and specific. In addition, forums help involve a variety of individuals in a study and help build participant commitment to assessment results. Forum processes help eliminate lengthy time lapses between data collection and analysis. Forums are relatively cost-effective in terms of monitary outlay, but quite costly in terms of assessor time.

On the negative side, forums are not statistically representative. Because participation is voluntary, representativeness depends on a wide variety of factors such as convenience of meeting locations and times, amount of advertising and community awareness, and community perceptions of the agency sponsoring the need assessment. Also, community forums are risky for the organization sponsoring

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the need study. In forums, assessors have little control over need statements that might surface, nor can assessors prevent constituents from developing unreal expectations of the organization. The assessor, however, can employ reasonable means to increase the number of participants and to lower the risk to the sponsor. An assessor can, for example, insure that meetings are well advertised in all areas of a community and that meetings are held in a variety of locations and at various times to account for diverse schedules. In addition, meetings can be held with the assistance of speakers of languages used by constituents not native to America. Researchers employed such strategies in the study reported here.

School system personnel agreed to handle advertisement announcing forum meetings. The meetings were held in locations accessible to the public and at varied times, including evenings and weekends. Participants attending a forum responded, on 5x8 cards, to a series of demographic questions. These questions included: (a) street name; (b) zip code; (c) number of children aged three, four, five, younger than three; (d) sex of respondent; (e) training or education as an early childhood caregiver; (f) current program utilization, type of care currently used for children; and (g) employment. In addition, participants listed the amount they would be willing to pay for responsive programs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The substantive question asked of all forum participants read: What needs do you have for the care and education of your children, ages three to five, that are not being met by existing programs, public or private, in the community? All questions, demographic and substantive, appeared on flip chart pages displayed in front of forum participants during the meetings.

Participants also wrote answers to the substantive question on their 5x8 cards. Assessors moved about during response time to encourage participants to write and to be certain that each participant understood the questions.

When all participants finished writing, assessors asked them to discuss the needs they had listed. As participants talked about program needs, they wrote down any further ideas. Assessors wrote down all comments made during this segment of a forum. When discussion waned or became repetitive, assessors collected the 5x8 cards, thanked participants, and ended the forum.

Need statements from the 5x8 cards and from participant comments together compiled the complete list of needs used in Phase Two of the MAP study. Appendix A contains the resultant list of all needs expressed either verbally or in writing by forum participants. In addition, Appendix A contains an analysis of need statements by the demographics asked of participants.

Phase Two. In order to move from this list of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

identified needs to relevant program alternatives (a process suggested by Morrissett, 1973) assessors employed the process of key informant utilization. Those conducting the study interviewed individuals in the community with specific professional positions or knowledge about the care and education of young children.

Murrell (Personal communication, October 13,1982) and Murrell, Aponte and Lin (1976) note that the key informant process is a method applied to individuals in the community who are expected to be especially familiar with needs in question. Witkin (1984) also describes key informant consultation as a useful assessment method. The process provides useful information on: (a) the professional viewpoint regarding programatic needs; and (b) the components of possible programs designed to respond to specific needs. Key informants should be selected in such a way that a wide variety of viewpoints and levels of expertise is represented (Cronback, 1982).

The use of key informants as a data collection method in need assessment is rather expensive in terms of time, but inexpensive in terms of actual cost. Key informant utilization is only moderately direct, as assessors collect data from professionals rather than from clients. However, by beginning the data collection with community meetings that permit clients (parents of children three to five years of age and other community members interested in preschool

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

programs) to express unmet needs, key informants may be used to respond to client needs without loss of directness.

The use of key informants yields specific data that are highly involving for participants. Those serving as key professionals may develop a strong sense of commitment to the study and its results because of their participation. Further, while key informant utilization is not particularly representative, it is primarily safe for the sponsor organization. Surprises are unlikely as key informants will usually know the organization and its constraints. Additional benefits of key informant methods include the ability to collect data and analyze them within short periods of time and the possible strengthening of lines of communication between various professionals in the community and decision makers in the agency sponsoring the assessment. Additional support for key informant utilization may be found in Bell, Lin and Warheit (1977), Gilmore (1977), Steadham (1980) and Warheit, Bell and Schwab (1974).

Assessors selected key informants on the basis of community needs for child care and education, their familiarity with existing child care programs, and their knowledge of community and fiscal restraints affecting the establishment of new programs. Assessors met with 18 such professionals and contacted 6 additional professionals by mail. Each professional received a copy of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the need list which appears in Appendix A. In addition, professionals received copies of the key informant worksheet which appears in Appendix B in completed form. Assessors asked professionals to design programs to meet expressed needs and to fill in the information about their ideas requested on the worksheet. Key informants kept these materials for approximately two weeks. Assessors picked up program ideas or received them in the mail from those informants not having face-to-face interviews.

Assessors combined program ideas in a single document found in Appendix B. Key informants reviewed all program ideas and rank ordered each in terms of priority. They also rated each idea as to the feasibility of implementation on a scale of one to five, one being most feasible and five being least feasible.

Assessors averaged prioritizations from all key informants to obtain mean ratings for all program ideas. Assessors used means to select the top fifteen program ideas subsequently presented to Nominal Group participants in Phase Three. Appendix C contains a list of the top fifteen program ideas emerging from the key informant phase of this study.

Phase Three. Researchers held six Nominal Group meetings in order to assess the acceptability of program ideas to members of divergent segments of the school system's community. The Nominal Group phase of the study

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

insured that key informant-generated data were relevant to potential users of implemented programs or services.

The Nominal Group Technique (NGT) was first employed and defended as a qualitative assessment technique by Delbecq (1977). The method provides the opportunity for community members to evaluate and clarify program ideas in a nonthreatening atmosphere. All participants have equal opportunities to respond to program ideas in an attempt to avoid artificial consensus and to encourage informed choices from each participant. The NGT has a structured, sequential format which allows adequate time for thought, avoids premature focus on single issues, promotes participation by all members, and provides a process for formation of aggregate judgments. Through the process of "estimate-talk-estimate", NGT reduces social pressures in the group, maximizes group understanding of the issues and avoids hasty or artificial movement toward consensus.

The NGT generates timely information (data are analyzed on the spot, during each meeting). In addition, NGT is relatively inexpensive. The process is direct in its approach to those in need. It is highly regarded for the specificity with which it can be used to address issues and for the degree of participant involvement it encourages. NGT is an excellent procedure for use in complementary tandem with community forums and key inform-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ants.

NGT, however, is not highly rated for its representativeness. Since all three techniques yield less than statistically representative data, the assessor may want to plan forums carefully to attract the widest number of constituents. The assessor may use other responses to the problem of representativeness with the multiphased model; such possible responses will be discussed below.

In this study, the assessment team contacted individuals with children in the targeted age range who participated in forums. Forum participants signed a registration sheet when they attended a meeting. They wrote their names, addresses and phone numbers on these sheets. Assessors matched cards of respondents with children to the address on the registration sheet to determine who would be contacted for Nominal Group participation. The assessors informed participants of this procedure and gave them the option of removing their names from the registration sheet. Participants received phone calls and reminder letters requesting their attendance at one of the six Nominal Group meetings. They were told that meetings were open to friends and neighbors with children in the age range, as well.

Assessors used a modified form of the NGT. They replaced Delbecq's first and second steps with the presentation of each of the program ideas. Ideas were dis-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

played visibly on flip chart pages and presented verbally, as well. At the beginning of each meeting the need assessors addressed the participants and presented the focus question regarding program acceptability. This question was: Assuming these programs are to be implemented, which would be the most acceptable to the members of your community and to you?

Participants selected from the top 15 program ideas presented to them in random order. Each program idea appeared on a flip chart page along with salient, brief descriptions and identifying letters. Participants chose the top 5 program ideas and wrote the corresponding letters on 3x5 cards. Then they ranked them, 1-5, 1 being the most acceptable program, 5 being the least acceptable of their choices. Assessors collected the cards and used markers to write votes on the flip chart pages.

Participants then discussed program ideas in round-robin fashion until all comments about each idea were heard. Assessors wrote down all comments verbatim, as much as possible.

Following discussion, participants again selected five programs and ranked them according to preference. Assessors collected the cards and again tabulated the votes on the flip chart pages. After discussing the final

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

vote, assessors adjourned each meeting with thanks to participants. Appendix D contains first and second vote results.

Results

Phase One. From the 6 community forums, assessors gleaned an extensive list of 91 need statements. The list of need statements, in participants' own words, appears in Appendix A. Assessors categorized needs as: (a) Care/Education/Activity; (b) Program Availability/Special Group; (c) Parent Contact/Connection/Participation; (d) Cost; (e) Relation to Existing Programs; (f) Staff/Personnel; (g) Physical; (h) Program Idea Cautions and Benefits; and (i) Miscellaneous. Analysis of need statements by demographics follows.

A total of 54 respondents participated in the 6 forums. Fifty-four percent of participants were parents of preschool-age children. Thirty-seven percent were presently using child care services, 72% were working outside of the home and 63% had previous training in early childhood education or care. Ten percent of respondents were male.

Thirteen percent of respondents noted they would be willing to pay $0 - $10 per week for programs that meet their needs, 7% would pay $11 - $20, 9% indicated amounts from $21 - $30, 17% were willing to pay $31 - $40,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2% would pay $41 - $50, 6% were willing to pay $51 - $60, and 4% stated they would pay whatever was required for quality programs. Six percent of respondents said the amount they would pay was dependent upon the type of program and age of the child. Thirty-seven percent did not respond to the cost question.

Respondents wrote 78 of the needs on their 5x8 cards; an additional 13 needs resulted from participant discussion.

Participants represented 21 zip codes. Needs by zip codes do not appear in appendices of this study, however, in order to protect anonymity of the sponsor school system. Needs expressed most consistently across zip codes were: (a) programs to consider a child's developmental stages; (b) stimulating environmental/real world experiences; (d) programs stressing independent self care; and (e) basic academic instruction. Each of these needs appeared across 30% - 35% of all zip codes represented.

Analysis of needs appears by children or no children in the targeted age range, by previous early childhood training, by use or nonuse of child care services, by the sex of a respondent, and by work or no work outside the home. Appendix A contains these breakdowns.

Twelve of the 91 needs appeared across all categories within subgroups with the exception of cost. These needs were: (a) programs to consider a child's developmental stages; (b) curriculum involving play and investigative

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

experiences; (c) stimulating environmental/real world experiences; (d) programs stressing social development; (e) programs stressing independent self-care; (f) basic academic instruction; (g) comprehensive programs addressing multiple content areas; (h) programs that do not interfere with kindergarten; (i) programs including enrichment activities; (j) half-day programs; (k) Saturday programs; (l) programs with vision and hearing screening.

Respondents with childhood training identified 30 needs not identified by those without such training; those without training expressed 16 needs not identified by trained persons.

Only three needs received endorsement by respondents in low ($0 - $10) and respondents in high (any amount for a quality program) paying categories. These needs were: (a) programs to consider a child's developmental stages; (b) basis academic instruction; and (c) small teacher-child ratios. Identified program needs varied according to the amount a respondent chose to pay for programs. The range of expressed needs for preschool programs also differed when analyzed by present use of child care programs and by employment status. Some of the variables that differed were program location, hours, program content, parent participation, and placement for children not meeting income, age or physical/mental standards of existing programs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Phase Two. In the reported study, 25 child care professionals participated as key informants. Of the 25, 18 responded during face-to-face interviews and 7 received materials for their response by mail. Of the 18, 15 responded within set time limits, permitting their responses to be used in the third phase of the study. Of the 7, one responded within established time limits. The useable response rate for those involved in face-to-face contact was 83%, as compared to a 14% usable response rate from those surveyed by mail. Of all key informants contacted, 64% participated fully in the study, or 16 of 25.

Members of the committee sponsoring the assessment, along with the assessors, selected key informants. Key informants were child care workers from private institutions, representatives from public programs provided for young children, individuals involved with the accrediting/licensing of early childhood programs, and representatives of concerned community groups familiar with the needs of the community for early childhood programs.

As shown in Appendix B, the 16 key informants generated 33 program ideas in response to the provided need list. While program ideas are condensed for presentation here, the more complete descriptions of each idea were available to the assessment sponsor.

Key informants also reviewed the need list and attemped to generate further needs that did not appear on the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

client-generated list. None of the key informants added any additional needs to the original list.

These professionals then viewed all generated program ideas, and rank-ordered them according to priority. The mean priority rankings given to program ideas ranged from a low of 8.8 to a high of 24.1. Assessors selected the top 15 program ideas, then, for presentation to Nominal Group participants. The selection of the top 15 ideas was an arbitrary decision made by assessors, as no clear cut-off point emerged where priority dramatically dropped from one idea to the next. Assessors needed to make the task manageable for participants, and they felt that 15 ideas were as many as participants could absorb in the few hours normally allotted to Nominal Group meetings.

In order of perceived importance, the key informants selected: (a) Year Round Five Day a Week Program - 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.; (b) School Day Program - 8:30 a.m. - 11:30 a.m. and 12:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.; (c) Year Round Five Day a Week Program - 8:30 a.m. - 3:20 p.m.; (d) Neighborhood Child Care Center; (e) Language Development; (f) MCPS Preschool/Day Care Pilot with Adult Education Component; (g) Extended Day Program; (h) Child Care Centers in Large Companies; (i) Parenting Classes; (j) Real World Knowledge/ Environment for Instruction, (k) Day and Night Development Center for Children - 24 Hours; (l) Integrated Preschool

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Long Day Program; (m) Parent Support Groups; (n) Integrated Preschool Short Day Program; and (o) Year Round Six Day a Week Program. These are the 15 program alternatives that were chosen as relevant and responsive to community needs.

Of the top 15 choices of the key informants, 7 of 15 (47%) focused on Care/Educational/Activity needs, 6 of 15 (40%) focused on Program Availability/Special Group needs, and 2 of 15 (13%) focused on Parent Contact/ Connection/Participation needs. Programs, however, were developed to address needs across the eight major categories. Assessors placed the program ideas in categories according to their major foci, even when they contained components from other categories.

Key informants also rated each program on the basis of the feasibility that such a program could be offered by the public schools. Their measures of feasibility appear in Appendix C. Mean feasibility ratings for the top 15 program ideas ranged from 1.73 to 3.93 on a scale of 1 to 5. The most feasible of the top 15 programs was Idea 2, Language Development. In order of decreasing feasibility, the remaining programs were Real World Knowledge/Environment for Instruction, the Extended Day Program, Parenting Classes, Year Round Five Day a Week Program (7 a.m.-6 p.m.) and School Day Program. See Appendix C for additional information on feasibility.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Phase Three. In the following analysis, assessors have relied on the summed weightings of all votes for each program idea in order to determine need-relevant ratings. Weightings were determined by giving any first place vote the value of five points, any second place vote the value of four points, any third place vote three points, a fourth place vote two points and a fifth place vote a single point.

Parents of preschool-age children attended one of six Nominal Group meetings held throughout the geographic area of the school district. A total of 26 community representatives attended one of these meetings. Appendix D contains the preliminary and final votes from Nominal Group meetings.

The top six programs emerging from preliminary voting were School Day Program, Language Development, Day and Night Development Center for Children - 24 Hours, Year Round Five Day A Week - 8:30 to 3:20, and Extended Day Program. With several exceptions, the voting changed significantly following discussions.

In the final vote, the top priority programs were School Day Program, Integrated Preschool Short Day Program, Extended Day Program, Year Round Five Day A Week Program - 8:30 to 3:20, and Year Round Five Day A Week Program - 7:00 a.m.-6:00 p.m.

While the two top programs remained the same in the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

final vote, the Extended Day Program moved from sixth to third in preference following discussion. Language Development and Day and Night Development Center were replaced in the final vote by the Year Round Five Day A Week Program - 7 a.m.-6:00 p.m. Discussion comments from each Nominal Group meeting help to explain reasons for vote changes. While these comments are not reported here, it is vital that assessors record all comment made during discussions.

Voting differed according to Nominal Group site. This finding suggests that different segments of a community may have varied needs requiring analysis of program selection by Nominal Group location. However, differences by site do not appear in analysis here in order to protect sponsor anonymity.

Discussion

This study can be considered as a source of information for determining alternatives based on the expressed needs of clients, professional judgments about programs relevant to their needs and community attitudes about the implementation of such programs. The more immediate relevance of the MAP study described here is the provision of objective program planning information to guide a public school system's decision makers as they begin to establish public preschool programs.

The MAP process depends, for success, on sufficiently

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

broad, frequent publicity prior to initial forum meetings to stimulate attendance. In addition, forums must be held in a wide variety of locations. In an area where strong ethnic populations exist, forums may need to be held in languages other than English and advertisements may need to be prepared in languages other than English. Locations for some of the forums should be convenient to the housing areas of ethnic groups in the community. These strategies can improve participation in forums and increase the likelihood that all factions of a community will be represented in initial meetings.

The use of key informants can help to lessen the negative impact of non-representativeness, also. For example, in the study described here, the number of participants was low considering the approximately 10,000 families in the school district with preschool children (from 1980 census data). The list of 91 generated needs, however, was so extensive that knowledgeable professionals could not come up with any additional needs. Even small numbers of forum participants can communicate adequately a wide range of community needs. Still, problems of self-selection and small sample size exist with MAP processes. Blanket advertisement and incentive programs may increase participation and lessen such problems.

The MAP process resulted in the recommendation of five possible preschool programs to the school system

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

for possible implementation. These five programs were the School Day Program, the Integrated Preschool Short Day Program, the Extended Day Program, the Year Round Five Day A Week Program (school hours), and the Year Round Five Day A Week Program (7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.). For complete descriptions of these ideas, see Appendix D. The selection of these programs reflects input from community members who expressed needs for programs, from key informants/child care professionals who designed responsive programs, and from parents of preschool children who selected from the array those programs they felt would be most responsive to their needs. The diversity of input and the potential for building consensus and developing commitment to resulting programs are unique results of the MAP process.

In addition, MAP techniques are inexpensive, although time-consuming. A district can initiate a MAP study, holding meetings in its own facilities, with minimal capital outlay. The system must invest in flip charts, markers, pencils, 5x8 cards, and paper for taking notes. All of the necessary materials appear on the bid sheets of most school systems and may be purchased internally. The advantages of low cost make MAP appealing to school systems engaged in financial cutbacks and lean budgeting.

The processes involved in MAP allow respondents the opportunity to have direct involvement in decisions that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

affect them. This involvement is increasingly important as schools face community demands for accountability and strive to improve community/school relations. Through this involvement, the school system can build relationships between its liaisons and parents, professional child care specialists, university professors, and business leaders.

The MAP method helps assessors determine specific needs. First, participants in forums are free to state needs; they are not forced to react to a predetermined list of possible needs that do not reflect the specific needs of a population. Second, in each phase of a MAP study, assessors gather more specific information. Finally, assessors can make specific recommendations to sponsors, define the characteristics of possible programs, and outline specific reactions of possible users to program ideas. This specificity and detail of information gives the MAP process an advantage over other available assessment models.

Finally, any assessment model is as useful as the resulting information is timely. The passage of time means changes in the needs of a community for preschool child care and education. An assessment must be done quickly enough that resulting information accurately reflects current needs. The assessment described here took place, from start to final report completion, over

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

a two month period. Thus, the resulting data were fresh and timely.

There is a disadvantage, in addition to respondent self-selection and lack of statistical representativeness, encountered when implementing a MAP study. Map processes help determine the spread of existing needs and the desirability of programs designed to meet existing needs. However, a complete MAP study does not yield numbers that indicate the extent to which a program would likely be utilized. Should a sponsor have a program already in mind, and should that sponsor need information concerning the extent to which a program is likely to be used, a MAP study would be inappropriate. MAP is most effective in settings where sponsors have not yet determined program components.

A sponsor may decide, following a complete MAP study, that only one program can feasibly be implemented. The sponsor may then need to know which program would be most beneficial and, therefore, successful. A follow-up survey is called for, but the process of survey construction is made simple by the MAP results. At this stage, the assessor need only design an instrument containing the top program ideas from the MAP study. Respondents, selected randomly, can then indicate whether they would likely utilize a program or not utilize it. In this way, a follow-up survey can become an additional phase

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of a MAP study, and the issue of representativeness is addressed effectively.

The MAP process remains flexible. It is possible, for example, to reverse the order of forum and Nominal Group. The Nominal Group format could be used to collect need statements and prioritize them. Following key informant use, forum meetings could be used to react openly to possible program ideas. In this study, assessors included census data in the study, a method referred to as social indicators in need assessment literature. The processes of MAP remain flexible and combine well with a variety of other assessment techniques when necessary or desired.

The rich qualitative information collected during discussion periods in all phases of MAP strengthens a study and provides direction to program planners. Not only do sponsors find out what their clients want, but they also learn why programs are favored or rejected. This qualitative information may well be the most valuable aspect of MAP; collection of such information certainly differentiates MAP from other assessment models.

Though MAP processes have several limitations, these limitations are not insurmountable, nor do they outweigh the advantages of MAP techniques. The MAP structure used here can provide school systems with a means for ascertaining a wide range of need and feasibility

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

information from professionals, from non-professional community members, and from clients/parents. The process can assist a school system in designing meaningful pre-school care and education programs within the community it serves.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NEED LIST

Definition of the Population:

Clients are defined as children in the Midwest metropolitan area who need care or educational services. The concern is with those children whose needs are not being met by existing programs, public or private.

Needs:

The following data are results of a series of community meetings held in the Spring of 1984. At these meetings, participants were asked to specify needs they have for care and preschool educational programs for their children, ages 3-5. Needs have been reproduced in the participants' language and have been grouped into certain categories for convenience. Feel free to address needs from several or all categories as you plan programs, or to regroup as you see fit. Generate as many programs responding to as many needs as possible.

Please note that some needs on this list may appear to be incompatible with one another. These ideas come from individuals representing numerous segments of the community and therefore reflect divergent needs.

CARE/EDUCATIONAL/ACTIVITY

1. Improve curriculum of existing centers
2. More quality child development programs
3. Structured programs designed to meet varied needs of 3-5 year olds at many developmental stages-no watered down elementary curriculum
4. Curriculum involving play and investigative activities
5. Quality experiences, stimulating environmental experiences for children of ages 3-5, exposure to the real world, stimulation to learn
6. Programs stressing experimentation/exploration/hands-on
7. Preparatory programs stressing communication (verbal), language stimulation with someone to read and talk to the child, early start to improve learning
8. Programs including art, drama, music, cooking
9. Programs personally, individually designed
10. Love and attention
11. Programs stressing social development and play with other children
12. Programs stressing development of independence for self-care, solving small problems for self

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

13. Academic instruction focusing on ABCs and numbers for familiarity/better education in basics/math, science, reading readiness
14. Comprehensive programs addressing areas of social development, physical, emotional, educational, cultural,psychological/self esteem
15. Programs for active children that do not interfere with kindergarten or overlap with it
16. Programs of learning/environment that permits learning
17. Programs for children who miss the age cut-off for public school kindergarten/early entrance into kindergarten for gifted
18. Academics but less structured than kindergarten
19. Foreign language instruction
20. Variety of materials that offer a child choices
21. Enrichment activities-field trips
22. Reading readiness-beyond if child is able
23. Creative atmosphere where learning is fun/warm, supportive environment
24. Curriculum that would prepare child for entry into public school
25. Prepare child for or refer child to placement in advanced programs
26. Gifted program
27. Non-working mothers want something more than a babysitting service

PROGRAM AVAILABILITY/SPECIAL GROUP

28. Full day programs, kindergarten extensions, same placement all day to avoid disruption for the child
29. Night shift care, 24 hour center, evenings, weekends
30. Summer programs-parents continue work during summer, year-round programs
31. Programs for children who are not able to qualify for Headstart but whose parents can not afford private care-some way to provide care for children who fall through the cracks-extension of Headstart to serve more children
32. Services available which care for children beyond regular school hours for working parents
33. Drop-in, pay-by-the-hour, for errands and for child social skill development
34. Afternoon programs to compliment half-day programs
35. Small child care really needed for working parents
36. Extending young child care for handicapped
37. Offered 10-12 A.M. morning program
38. Program convenient to neighborhoods
39. Program close to or in the same building attended by older children

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

40. 1/2 day program, 3 days a week
41. Services offered to all children so that children mix with others from varied racial/ SES backgrounds
42. Saturday programs
43. Interconnected half-day programs that would provide full-day care between them
44. Five day a week program
45. Varied programs that offer choices for parents

PARENT CONTACT/CONNECTION/PARTICIPATION

46. Parent development program, parent training to prepare them for partnership role in meeting a child's needs
47. Program where parents are required to volunteer or spend time in the classrooms
48. Mini-training seminars for parents and preschool teachers for the purpose of sharing ideas
49. Ways to bring more parents into the school- place programs for young child in the schools so parents could participate in school life more
50. Good communication between parents and staff
51. Skills checklist kept on child- information shared with parents
52. Parent information booklet with available programs for the gifted
53. Some way to help a parent who wishes to stay home with a young child

COST

54. Low cost, quality, developmental programs, especially for "overburdened" parents- for those of low income, students, un- or under-employed
55. Low-income, subsidized program with pay for care on sliding scale-more funding to assist people who can't afford-scholarships
56. Program with minimal costs
57. Current cost of care prohibitive of its use- need lower cost care
58. Reasonable cost through state/city/federal support

RELATION TO EXISTING PROGRAMS

59. Need to insure that new programs do not force good existing programs out of business - make complimentary, not competing
60. Coordination of public and private services so that both offer similar programs/association between public and private care
61. Utilize existing preschool lab at a junior

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

college in the community
62. Coordination of day care and educational programs (half day kindergarten) so child could be moved from one site to another when necessary during parents' working days

STAFF/PERSONNEL

63. Provide early childhood specialist/teacher for local spouse abuse center
64. Small qualified teacher-child ratios/ 5-6 children per teacher
65. Better qualified teachers
66. More teacher time, less time with assistants
67. Specialists/staff necessary for structured, educational preschool program
68. Midwest needs to become a leader in stressing importance of early childhood certification for the staffs of new programs

PHYSICAL

69. Proper rest during time of care
70. Proper food (meals and snacks)
71. Physical education-gross motor skills
72. Movement activities/dance
73. Excellent physical environment designed for safety and optimum learning-clean, safe playgrounds for young children
74. Transportation
75. All physical needs must be met
76. Arrangements for child who is ill (but not seriously) so parents do not have to leave or miss work-medical attention when needed

PROGRAM IDEA CAUTIONS AND BENEFITS

77. Avoid overidentification of early childhood care with concepts of "going to school"
78. Program could be designed to permit vision and hearing screening before child enters school
79. Children 3-5 do not need to be involved in a formal education process at all
80. Questions about the public school system taking a role in early childhood-do a better job with what they already do before adding responsibilities
81. How to coordinate with the school system's other responsibilities

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

82. Programs should be public rather than private since the public arena is more qualified to provide good care
83. Consider separate needs for custodial care and educational programs
84. Build on good models such as the preschool lab at the cooperating university

MISCELLANEOUS

85. "New Kids Day" concept-programs that permit children to visit kindergarten sites prior to enrollment
86. Publicity for available programs-publication listing available services of all kinds so parents could visit and select
87. Tap into public library programs
88. Consider adequate existing programs
89. Need for programs that will mainstream the handicapped
90. No busing of young children
91. Christian environment

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Needs Expressed in Writing (Forums)
by

	Child in age group	Sex-Male	Pre-school training	No training	Care	No care	Job	No job
1			X		X		X	
2	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
3	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
4	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
5	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
6			X		X		X	X
7			X			X		X
8	X		X		X	X	X	X
9	X		X		X		X	
10	X		X	X	X	X	X	
11	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
12	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
13	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
14	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
15	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
16	X			X		X		X
17	X			X		X	X	X
18	X		X	X		X	X	X
19	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
20	X			X	X		X	
21	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
22	X	X		X	X		X	
23	X			X	X		X	
24	X		X	X	X		X	X
25	X		X		X	X	X	X
26	X		X		X			X
27	X		X		X			X
28	X		X	X	X	X	X	
29	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
30	discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
31			X	X		X	X	
32			X			X	X	
33	X		X	X		X	X	
34			X			X	X	
35		X		X	X		X	
36		X	X	X	X		X	
37	X	X		X		X	X	
38	X			X	X	X	X	
39	discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
40	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
41	X		X		X		X	
42	X		X	X	X		X	X
43			X		X		X	
44	X		X		X		X	
45	X			X	X		X	
46			X			X	X	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Needs Expressed in Writing (Forums) by

Child in age group	Sex-Male	Pre-school training	No training	Care	No care	Job	No job
47		X			X	X	
48			X		X	X	
49	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards						
50	X	X		X			X
51	X	X		X			X
52	X	X		X			X
53	X	X	X		X		X
54		X	X		X	X	
55		X	X		X	X	
56	X		X		X	X	X
57	X	X	X	X		X	
58	X	X		X		X	
59	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards						
60		X	X		X	X	
61		X					
62	X	X	X	X		X	
63		X			X	X	
64	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
65	X	X	X	X	X	X	
66	X		X		X		
67	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards						
68	X	X		X		X	
69	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards						
70	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards						
71		X			X	X	
72	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards						
73		X	X	X	X	X	
74	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards						
75	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards						
76	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards						
77		X			X	X	
78	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
79	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards						
80	X	X	X	X		X	
81		X	X	X		X	
82	X		X		X		X
83			X		X	X	
84	X	X		X		X	
85	X	X		X		X	
86	X	X		X		X	X
87	X	X		X		X	
88	X	X	X	X		X	X
89		X	X	X		X	
90	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards						
91	X	X	X	X	X		X

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Amount Willing to Pay by Needs Expressed (Forums)

	$0-$10	$11-$20	$21-$30	$31-$40	$41-$50	$51-$60	Any for quality	Open
1						X		
2		X	X			X		
3	X	X		X		X	X	X
4			X	X				X
5	X	X		X		X		X
6				X				
7	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
8				X		X		X
9				X		X		
10	X			X				
11	X	X	X	X		X		
12				X		X		X
13	X			X			X	X
14		X	X	X		X		
15	X	X				X		
16	X							
17	X		X					
18	X							X
19	X					X		X
20	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
21				X		X		
22				X				
23				X			X	
24	X							
25				X				X
26								X
27								X
28			X	X	X			X
29		X		X				
30	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
31	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
32								X
33		X						
34	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
35	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
36					X			
37			X					
38				X				
39	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
40			X					X
41		X			X			
42								X
43					X			
44		X						
45			X					
46								X
47								X
48	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Amount Willing to Pay (cont.)						Any for quality	Open
	$0-$10	$11-$20	$21-$30	$31-$40	$41-$50	$51-$60		
49	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
50								X
51								X
52								X
53			X					
54								X
55				X				
56	X							
57		X		X				
58		X						
59	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
60	X					X		
61	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
62							X	
63				X				
64	X	X		X			X	X
65	X	X						
66	X							
67	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
68		X						
69	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
70	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
71	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
72	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
73	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
74	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
75	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
76	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
77	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
78			X				X	
79	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
80		X						
81					X			
82			X	X				
83	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
84						X		
85						X		
86						X		X
87	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
88								X
89					X			
90	Discussion only, appeared on none of the cards							
91						X		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix B

MAP 38

Need Assessment
Key Informant Ratings

The following list is a composite of program alternatives generated by Midwest individuals with expertise in the areas of child care and education. These program ideas address the unmet needs of parents of preschool children. Please rank order the ideas from #1 (greatest priority) on, based on your professional judgment of community needs and program responsiveness.

Program Idea	Definition/Description	Cost
CARE/EDUCATION		
1. Real World Knowledge Environment for Instruction	1. Tightly structured-based on pride in self-achievement-utilizing as many modalities as possible, teaching routine activities (dress, etc), communication skills (answer telephone, hold writing tools), and safety skills.	?
2. Language Development	2. Intensive communication training for children; workshops for teachers on language development is essential. Also, a good understanding of how long to spend, how language is learned, etc. Parent Child Play to Learn Package Peabody Language Development Kit	training- $5 per child per week $370 one time cost
3. Year-Round Six day a week Program	3. Care from 6:00 A.M. until 6:00 P.M.	$45 in tandem with special staffing and workshop ideas
4. Year-Round Five day a week Program	4. 7:00 A.M.-6:00 P.M. located in closed school buildings in each region--no drop-ins. Written, set curriculum for all three yr. olds, four yr. olds not eligible for Headstart, five yr. olds after/before kindergarten. One certified teacher with three assistants. One to ten adult/child ratio.	None projected

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MAP 39

Program Idea	Definition/Description	Cost
5. Year-Round Five day a week Program	5. 8:30 A.M.-3:20 P.M. For 3 and 4 yr. olds during regular school hours, with meals. Focus on motor skills, "hands-on" materials, task orientation, preparation for kindergarten. Monthly parent-teacher conferences, weekly progress report, one day a month staff inservice. School-system based health service. Business support. Regional. 20 to 1 student/teacher ratio with 2 assistants, 3 parent volunteers.	None projected
6. "I'm Special-You're Special Too"	6. To help children come to a sense of themselves as unique and gifted. To help them begin to appreciate gifts of each other. (Grandparent sharing; cultural differences; etc.) "High-Scope Program" is example.	No more than regular cost of day care
7. Conflict Resolution	7. Designed to teach children non-violent ways to compromise and cooperate rather than compete to get things done.	$2 per child per week
8. Educational Program	8. Acadmeically-based 1/2 day mini-school approach	None projected
9. Preschool Pilot with Adult Education Component	9. Small, quiet pilot program, alternative funding, (United Way, etc.) go where greatest need is as in public housing projects, to women on AFDC-includes careful evaluation before extension.	None projected

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MAP 40

Program Idea	Definition/Description	Cost
10. School-day Program for 3-5 year olds 8:30-11:30 12:30- 3:30	10. Housed in public schools or existing community centers buildings where enrollment is decreasing- to provide neighborhood children with care and developmental activities. Opportunities for parent participation- use of older children in the school to assist in care and education of young children. May be modeled on Institute for Creative Learning.	$20 per week plus training costs
11. Montessori Pre-school 3-5 yr. old Classroom	11. Unique approach emphasizing positive, sequential learning experiences emphasizing practical life skills, social and academic skills, and expressive arts. Based on Montessori Preschool model as endorsed by Montessori Centers.	½ day-$20 weekly full day-$40 weekly
PROGRAM AVAIL-ABILITY/SPECIAL GROUP		
12. Identification and Stimulation of Minority Gifted Children	12. Direct and develop creativity through enriching activities with open-ended processes.	None given
13. Preschool for Gifted Students	13. Multiple criteria for eligibility-IQ, parent checklist, teacher recommendations. ½ day program tied to existing day care centers for full day care.	None given
14. Early Admission to Kindergarten	14. Psychological testing and counseling-for social and emotional maturity as well as educational needs. Provisions must be made for those who should start school early	None given

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MAP 41

Program Idea	Definition/Description	Cost
15. Integrated Preschool-(handicapped with typical peers) Long Day Program	15. Daily preschool hours, 5 days a week. Ten children to one teacher, one assistant. Two handicapped children. Emphasizes social and motor skills, self-help, language. School system facilities and transportation. Most materials free. Parent volunteers. Parent consultation and newsletter. Health screening, school lunches. Skill development tracking and individualized instruction.	$70 estimate
16. Integrated Preschool Short Day Program	16. Same as above- Mon-Fri., 9:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M.	$25 per child with sliding scale provision
17. School-based Early Intervention Services	17. Mon-Fri., 9:00-3:00 P.M. Three regional classes in the school system's geographic area serving 60 children, 24 of whom are handicapped. Each class has one teacher and two aides. School system transportation.	$37.50 per week-discounted fees available based on family income
18. Special Education Preschool Program	18. Need special care, lower pupil-teacher ratio. Should not have small children who are handicapped mainstreamed.	Need for federal aid to keep costs down
19. Neighborhood Childcare Center	19. For underserved or low income families- child care with major adult education emphasis for promoting neighborhood ties.	None given
20. Day and Night Development Center	20. Community location-child centered program with flexible hours-one qualified teacher to fifteen children with a director, paraprofessionals and volunteers.	Sliding scale-combination of public and private funds

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MAP 42

Program Idea	Description/Definition	Cost
21. Extended Day Program for Children	21. Kindergarten program in A.M. with supervised P.M. activities to provide more continuity in child's day.	Sliding scale from total subsidy to full tuition
22. Childcare Centers in Large Companies	22. Places children near parents- meets a number of needs.	?
PARENT CONTACT		
23. Parents' Co-op Program	23. Help non-working parents set up cooperative drop-in program with salaried director and trained parent staff.	Depends on amount of parent participation
24. Parent Volunteer Credit	24. Parents assist in child care by donating time.	Public and private fees are supplimented by parent volunteers with set amounts of credit awarded per work hour
25. Informational Brochure/ Newsletter	25. Develop a brochure listing the various preschool and daycare centers, program designs, cost, and enrollment procedures.	Free
26. Parent Checklist	26. Checklist for parents to use when visiting preschool and daycare centers for purposes of matching programs with child's needs.	Free
27. Parenting Classes	27. Systematic community-wide parent and child care worker effectiveness training.	$10 per family

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MAP 43

Program Idea	Definition/Description	Cost
28. Parent Support Groups	28. Weekly parent meetings-topics for discussion designed to help parents cope with the preschool child.	None given
STAFF/PERSONNEL		
29. Consultation Model	29. Curriculum consultation for program development. Emphasizes needs identified in public forums. Consultant visits sites for development of individualized programs addressing student needs. Training offered to staff.	Difficult to project cost but could be developed through existing agencies
30. Resource Pool of Adults	30. Train interested adults who would like to care for children one-on-one as needed. Resource file listing citizen talents and resources.	$1,000 per year for training $15 per day per child
31. Staff Development and Training	31. Licensing updating on Minneapolis/St. Paul model. Continuing education for employees taught by qualified certified personnel- use of guest speakers. CDA training model.	Expensive- could be lowered through grants or contracts
32. Program Identification	32. Custodial, educational and enrichment programs that are available in multiple communities. Information source locating and describing all such programs.	None given
PHYSICAL		
33. Health Screening	33. Vision/hearing screening coordinated with public health department-includes staff training for some of these tasks.	$5 one-time fee

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Priority and Feasibility Means by Priority

Priority Rank	Program	Priority Mean	Feasibility Mean	Feasibility Rank
1	4	8.8	2.53	11.5
2	10	9.3	2.53	11.5
3	5	10.8	2.60	13.0
4	19	10.9	2.80	17.5
5	2	11.5	1.73	4.0
6	9	12.2	2.87	19.5
7	21	12.5	2.07	6.5
8	22	12.7	3.06	24.5
9	27	12.8	2.33	8.0
10	1	13.0	2.07	6.5
11	20	13.8	3.93	33.0
12	15	14.6	3.26	28.0
13	28	14.7	2.77	16.0
14	16	14.8	2.73	15.0
15	3	15.5	2.80	17.5
16	6	15.6	1.87	5.0
17	31	16.1	2.47	9.5
18.5	12	16.3	3.06	24.5
18.5	33	16.3	1.60	2.0
20	18	16.5	3.53	32.0
21	29	16.6	2.93	21.0
22	13	16.8	3.40	29.5
23	17	17.0	3.40	29.5
24	26	17.3	1.47	1.0
25	25	17.5	1.67	3.0
26	11	18.6	3.00	22.5
27	23	19.1	3.13	26.5
28	7	20.0	2.47	9.5
29	30	20.1	2.67	14.0
30	14	21.5	3.13	26.5
31	24	21.9	3.00	22.5
32	8	24.1	3.50	31.0
33	32	24.1	2.87	19.5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Key Informant Comments About Each Program Idea

1. Real World Knowledge Environment for Instruction	Should include "walking around" sense but any parent should be able to do this Important
2. Language Development	Speech therapists needed but hard to come by--cost of these professionals is high-- cost projected is unrealistic Reservations about structure--are kits necessary? Just talking to kids may be most important I've heard good things about the Peabody from centers that use it
3. Year Round Six Day A Week Program	Difficult to pull off--the public school system should not start here How about finances?
4. Year Round Five Day A Week Program, 7:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.	Use open elementary schools that have space--too expensive and unsafe to use closed facility Question shape or availability of closed school buildings--program should serve parents well No "drop-ins" Unrealistic to have MCPS program that is totally different in terms of hours Fire hazzard? Safety? Accessibility for children?
5. Year Round Five Day A Week Program, 8:30 A.M. to 3:20 P.M.	Does not seem to fit needs--only serves non-working or parttime working parents. How many jobs are over at 3:20?
6. "I'm Special-You're Special Too"	All children should have a sense of their own specialness-definitely should be done Combination of grandparents/elderly and children's institutions would have a lot to offer Idea may require a social worker or someone with similar skills Other programs exist that are

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	similar Incorporate in other programming
7. Conflict Resolution	Should be assumed and always done Not expensive, but does it meet needs? Qualified individuals available? Incorporate in other programming
8. Educational Program	Feasible but objectionable Children should not be treated as a commodity and "mini-school" is a turn-off because of its money-making philosophy What needs served here? Have these programs already--does MCPS wish to compete? Unnecessary
9. MCPS Preschool Day Care Pilot with Adult Education Component	Somewhat novel-has merit
10. School Day Program for 3-5 yr. olds, 8:30-11:30, 12:30-3:30	Fine--need to watch that older child is not cheated where his instruction is concerned Older child should be significantly older Use of older children a bad idea Accessibility/facilities for preschooler
11. Montessori Preschool, 3-5 yr. old Classroom	Already available for a fee Inappropriate to use public money for this approach Seems to be a good approach but already exists
12. Identification and Stimulation of Minority Gifted Children	Similar programs do exist--how is this idea to be implemented? Need more specifics Identification of target group may be difficult Funding is a problem Intent good-but witness the advanced program
13. Preschool for Gifted Children	Real problems with selecting gifted children at these early ages-- a need to educate parents who want to push their children too quickly Certainly feasible but should not be done

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

14. Early Admittance to MCPS	Early admittance, below 5 years, should not be permitted Not a good idea
15. Integrated Preschool (handicapped with typical peers) Long Day Program	Wonderful idea but not very realistic Staff for idea is expensive as well as is special equipment for appropriate care of handicapped Intent of program idea is positive, but must be done correctly--may depend on extent of served handicaps Special facilities problems with handicapped children
16. Integrated Preschool Short Day Program	No comments
17. School-based Early Intervention Services Mon-Fri, 9:00-3:00 Three locations in MCPS for 4 year olds	Eight handicapped to twelve non-handicapped is too high a proportion Could set up a vehicle in the community as a clearing house in intervention
18. Special Education Preschool Program	Private programs such as this exist--can not use federal funds and run a program that isolates the handicapped child Good idea
19. Neighborhood Child Care Center	Wonderful but funding questionable It seems contradictory Not very high priority Parents do not want the parenting component
20. Day and Night Development Center for Children--24 hours	Could possibly tap industry to help support this needed program--could run with professionals with fewer qualifications at night if children would mostly be sleeping Would industry question subsidy if greatest need were with those who are unemployed? Community location not feasible-would be too expensive-could only have one center which would have to be central

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

21. Extended Day Program for Children	Feasible--should be done Headed in the right direction
22. Child Care Centers Within Large Companies	Already done in some companies-perhaps a need for expansion Should be pushed Good way to go
23. Parents' CO-Op Program	Difficult to plan staffing for drop-in program Volunteer recruitment is difficult No drop-ins!
24. Parent Volunteer Program	Parent volunteerism does not meet a number of needs-meals, property rental, insurance, custodial service, etc. must be considered Those who need service may have little time to give service No to parents getting such credit
25. Informational Brochure/ Newsletter	See these examples-Spots for Tots, Pre-School Directory Develop a checklist to help parents during site visits to accompany the brochure Expensive to print-who assumes the cost? Good idea Already done by an agency in the area
26. Parent Checklist	Could be open to abuse--who creates the checklist? List could be created in such a way that certain programs shine as a result of its use Already done by a local agency What about printing costs?
27. Parenting Classes	Would like to see more of this Cost is worrisome--perhaps those who can not afford it may need it most Alternate funding? Tough to do--people you most want to reach have least amount of time

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

28. Parent Support Groups	Facilitator, planner of meetings must be paid--cost to parents would have to reflect this May not be needed with parenting classes Parent involvement would depend on cost--much involvement if little or no cost, little follow-through if cost Weekly is too often
29. Consultation Model	Sounds very good Expensive, feasible if money is available Very expensive Could be done--receptivity of host program's staff may be questionable
30. Resource Pool of Adults	How can we be sure these adults are competent to care for children? Who screens, who verifies these people? Some danger in this approach Would love to do-- tutoring? May be impossible Question of health and safety of elderly which may be unstable Vocational school and local college already do this
31. Staff Development and Training	Advisable-surely needed Cost is prohibitive Must be done!
32. Program Identification	Duplicate of #25 Not bad idea but how done? Enough variety already exists in all communities
33. Health Screening	Definitely already done Already available for free For 4 and 5 yr. olds-screeing professionals come to centers-spend 1½ hours and screen all Done by private agencies such as Midwest Department to Prevent Blindness. Hearing Board of Health, etc. Feasible if small fee charged Done in elementary schools now

Such compilation of comments is done at each stage of the need study, forum, key informant, and Nominal Group. The presentation of comments is an important part of a study.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix C

Top Program Ideas As Presented to Nominal Group Participants

A. Neighborhood Child Care Center
B. Parenting Classes
C. Extended Day Program
D. Parent Support Groups
E. Year Round Five Day A Week Program
F. Child Care Centers in Large Companies
G. Day and Night Development Center for Children-24 hours
H. School Day Program (3-5 year olds) 8:30-11:30, 12:30-3:30
I. Real World Knowledge Environment for Instruction
J. Year Round Five Day A Week Program, 7:00A.M. to 6:00 P.M.
K. Language Development
L. Integrated Preschool/Long Day Program
M. MCPS Preschool/ Day Care Pilot with Adult Education Component
N. Integrated Preschool Short Day Program
O. Year Round Six Day A Week Program

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix D

Preliminary Vote/Nominal Groups/Aggregate Data

Number of votes at each rank

Program	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
A.	1	--	1	--	1
B.	--	2	1	1	--
C.	2	2	2	2	1
D.	3	--	3	1	1
E.	2	2	2	1	3
F.	1	2	2	2	--
G.	3	1	1	3	2
H.	5	4	1	1	6
I.	1	1	3	4	2
J.	2	1	1	4	1
K.	2	3	3	2	2
L.	--	1	2	1	2
M.	--	1	1	1	2
N.	4	4	--	2	1
O.	--	--	1	--	--

The top programs in rank order from preliminary voting are H, N, G, E, and C.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Final Vote/ Nominal Groups/ Aggregate Data

	Number of votes at each rank				
Program	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
A.	--	--	--	--	1
B.	1	1	--	--	1
C.	3	1	1	5	--
D.	--	--	2	2	2
E.	1	2	4	2	2
F.	--	--	1	--	3
G.	4	1	1	1	1
H.	8	4	3	1	--
I.	--	2	4	2	1
J.	1	3	2	3	2
K.	2	2	1	2	2
L.	--	--	4	3	5
M.	--	--	1	1	1
N.	4	8	--	--	3
O.	--	--	--	2	--

The top programs in rank order from final voting are H, N, C, E, and J.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MAP 55

Description of Top Program Ideas

Program Idea	Definition/Description	I.D. # of needs met	Cost per child per week
N. Preschool Mon-Fri 9:00-1:00 3-5 yr. olds	An integrated preschool providing services for handicapped and nonhandicapped children. Major emphasis is on development of each child's potential through the use of individualized programs which focus primarily on social, emotional, language, cognitive, motor and independent skills. Positive learning environment enhances the development of self esteem through the use of experimental curriculum.	3,4,5,6,7,8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 31, 37, 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 78, 87, 89.	$25 per child (discounted fees available based on family income)
H. School-day Program for Children, 3-5. 8:30-11:30 12:30- 3:30	Housed in public school buildings with decreasing enrollment, space is available. To provide neighborhood children with care and developmental activities, to give parents opportunities to participate under professional supervision in the education of young children. To give older children some experience in working with young children. Distinguishing characteristics: parent involvement, cross age associations of children, early	Most	combination of public funds and private fees supplimented by use of volunteers

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MAP 56

Program Idea	Definition/Description	I.D. # of needs met	Cost per child per week
	childhood education as part of MCPS		
C. Extended Day Program	For children of working parents. Kindergarten program in A.M. with supervised activities in P.M. to add continuity to the child's day	28, 32, 34, 41, 44.	cost may be on a sliding scale from total subsidy to full cost/tuition
E. Year Round Five Day A Week-school hours	To develop and motivate learning in 3 and 4 yr. olds not able to attend regular school programs. Operated by MCPS. Activities that enhance development and that enrich and compliment the MCPS kindergarten program. One per region. Twenty pupils per unit, one teacher, two assistants, three parent volunteers. (8:30-3:20, M-F). Breakfast, lunch, milk break. Monthly parent-teacher conferences, weekly progress reports. One day a month staff inservice. Stresses good attendance, drop those who miss often without excuse.	5, 6, 8, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 31, 41, 44.	no charge for low income, sliding scale
J. Year Round Five Day A Week Program 7:00 A.M.- 6:00 P.M.	Early Childhood Center. Would serve all 3s, 4s not in Head-start, 5s before, after kinder-	3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16,	Cost would have to be competitive with existing day care

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MAP 57

Program Idea	Definition/Description	I.D. # of needs met	Cost per child per week
	garten. Meals, one certified teacher to three assistants, one coordinator in each center, one over all. One in each region, possibly in closed buildings. No drop-ins. Set written curriculum concentrating on social, emotional, physical, educational needs of children and parents. Responsible for vision, hearing screening. Basic self help skills encouraged. Beginning basic academic skills. Oral language development. Community experiences provided.	17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 38, 41, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 81, 85, 86, 87, 89, 90, 91.	Low-income subsidized program with pay for care on sliding scale Business involvement to help costs

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

Bell, R. A., Lin, E., & Warheit, C. G. (1977). Issues in need assessment data collection strategies. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, California. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 149 208)

Cronback, L. (1982). Designing evaluations of educational and social programs. Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Delbecq, A. L. (1976). The nominal group technique for understanding the qualitative dimensions of client needs. In R. Bell, M. Sundel, J. Aponte, & S. Murrell (Eds). Need assessment in health and human services. Proceedings of the Louisville National Conference, Louisville, Kentucky.

Dunbar, K., Barnes, G., Carrithers, V., Koppel, S., & Murrell, S. (1983). When professionals and communities agree: Matching program responsiveness with community acceptance. Paper presented at a professional workshop sponsored by Seven Counties Services, Inc., Louisville, Kentucky.

Gilmore, G. (1977). Needs assessment processes for community health education. International Journal of Health Education, 20(3), 164-173.

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Koppel, S. & Dunbar, K. (1984). A multiphased need assessment for program decisions. In review.

Koppel, S. (1985). A multiphased assessment of automation needs. Unpublished manuscript, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky. Assisted by Karen D. Isenhour.

Koppel, S. (1986). An assessment model for program decisions: Bridging the divide between need assessment and program development. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky.

Morrissett, I. (1973). Accountability, needs assessment, and social studies. Social Education, 38 (4), 271-279.

Murrell, S. A., Aponte, J. F., & Lin, E. (1976). An introduction: The context of need assessment. In R. A. Bell, M. Sundel, J. F. Aponte, & S. A. Murrell (Eds). Need assessment in health and human services. Proceedings of the Louisville National Conference, Louisville, Kentucky.

Steadham, S. V. (1980) Learning to select a needs assessment strategy. Training and Development Journal, 34(1), 56-61

:ST COPY AVAILABLE

Warheit, C. G., Bell, R. A., & Schwab, G. G. (1974). Planning for change: Needs assessment approaches. Rockville, Maryland: National Institute of Mental Health.

Witkin, B. R. (1984). Assessing needs in educational and social programs. Washington: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE